



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                 | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 09/838,382                      | 04/20/2001      | Harry D. Danforth    | 0100.00             | 9258            |
| 25295 7                         | 7590 03/19/2004 |                      | EXAM                | INER            |
| USDA, ARS, OTT                  |                 |                      | HINES, JANA A       |                 |
| 5601 SUNNYSIDE AVE<br>RM 4-1159 |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER    |
| BELTSVILLE, MD 20705-5131       |                 |                      | 1645                |                 |

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | 09/838,382   | DANFORTH ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Ja-Na Hines  | 1645  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | · · · · · · · ·  |   |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED February 13, 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires _months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH            | g date of the final rejection.<br>IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP                          |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C  | f extension and the corresponding amounted the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>19 December 2003</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) 🗵 they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: None.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: None.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 2</u> .   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen  | t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ Other:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 09/838,382

\* Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new claims are drawn to deposited immunovariant strain E. maxima which has the characteristics of protecting against challenge with ATCC PTA-4959 but does not protect against Guelph strain or E. maxima-GLP and has no detectable immunological cross reactivity with E. maxima-GLP. The previous claims were simply drawn to a strain of E. maxima-I. The new claims require further consideration and/or search and therefore the after final amendment will not be entered. Moreover, the amendment does not materially reduce or simply the issues, rather the amendment significantly narrows the invention, thereby raising

Applicants request for reconsideration has been noted, however applicants arguments are drawn to the newly proposed after final amendments. There appears to be no reason of record why these amendments were not presented during the prosecution of the case. The issues and claims now presented are not directed to the particular subject matter which was under final rejection, and the accompanying arguments are directed towards newly submitted claims.

Moreover, the reasons for not entering the newly submitted claims have

been discussed above.

CINETTE H. F. SMITE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE PECHNOLOGY CENTER SHOP